

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

ROCKY DWAYNE HILL, #102088,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:23-cv-431-JDK
	§	
GREGG COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Rocky Hill, a former inmate confined at the Gregg County Jail proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On September 10, 2024, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court dismiss this case without prejudice for failure to comply with a Court order. Docket No. 13. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff at his last-known address, with an acknowledgment card. The docket reflects that the mail was returned as “undeliverable,” with a notation that he is no longer at the facility. Docket No. 14. To date, Plaintiff has neither filed objections nor otherwise communicated with the Court.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not file objections, and the objection period has expired. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 13) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for Plaintiff’s failure to comply with an order of the Court. Any and all motions which may be pending in this case are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **15th** day of **January, 2025**.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Jeremy D. Kernodle", is written over a horizontal line.

JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE